

R E M A R K S

By this Amendment the specification has been amended to improve its presentation and claims 1-9 have been amended to better define the invention. Entry is requested.

In the outstanding final Office Action the examiner has rejected claims 1, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krokstad et al. in view of Kanamori et al., he has rejected claims 2-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krokstad et al. in view of Kanamori et al. and Arcos et al., and he has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krokstad et al. in view Kanamori et al., Arcos et al. and Le Bel.

The rejections are without merit.

In his analysis the examiner asserts that Kanamori et al. disclose at column 16, line 64 to column 17, line 7 a noise microphone which detects noise from touch of the device and the noise is filtered by the filter (see last two lines of page 3 of the final Office Action). However, the passage referred to by the examiner reads as follows:

"The adaptive filter 30 performs a learning operation for suppressing internal noise. The vibration oriented noise disturbs the learning operation. In order to avoid such a situation, in this example, the first and second main microphones 11 and 12 and the noise reference microphone 5 are maintained in a floating state with respect to the housing 10. Accordingly, even

when a physical touch on or an operation of the audio visual apparatus 900 generates a noise or when a collision of the audio visual apparatus 900 against something generates vibration noise, the adaptive filter 30 can perform stable learning operation."

As explained in Kanamori et al., keeping the microphones in a floating state amounts to keeping them vibrationally isolated from the apparatus and its casing, and in this way assures that noise from touching or colliding with the casing does not affect the ongoing signal processing carried out on the microphone signals.

In column 16, lines 45-54 this is explained:

"The microphone unit attachment board 7 is maintained in a vibration-free state with respect to the housing 10 by the damper 8, so as to act as a vibration noise reduction section for suppressing transfer of vibration of the mechanism section 20 to the microphones 11,12, and 5. The damper 8 acts to elastically support the microphone unit attachment board 7 and the damper 8 can be integrally formed of an elastic material such as rubber"

And further on column 17, lines 9-15:

"The filter coefficient of the adaptive filter member is updated in response to an operating signal which is generated at the time of an operation of the mechanism section. Accordingly, only when the mechanism section generates internal noise, the filter coefficient of the adaptive filter member is updated and thus appropriately converged so as to cancel the internal noise."

By vibrationally isolating the microphones from the casing, it is thus assured, according to Kanamori et al., that "only when the mechanism section generates internal noise" this noise will be cancelled.

The examiner's statement that Kanamori et al. teach that "noise microphone detects noise from touch of device" appears quite incorrect when what is attempted in Kanamori et al. is actually to prevent noise from touch of the device from being detected by the noise microphone.

Kanamori et al. disclose a device for use in an apparatus having a mechanism section generating internal noise inside a housing of the apparatus. It is attempted to prevent this internally generated noise from corrupting a microphone signal comprising audio from the surroundings. Kanamori et al. disclose an apparatus with built in microphones and a signal processing scheme, which is to ensure that only sounds from the environment are recorded. All of this teaches away from the present

invention. No mechanism section generating internal noise inside the housing of the apparatus is part of the present invention, and it is not attempted to prevent such internally generated noise from corrupting a microphone signal comprising audio from the surroundings.

The applicants assert that Kanamori et al. cannot be combined with Krokstad et al. to suggest the presently claimed invention, and nothing in Aros et al. or Le Bel would overcome this deficiency.

Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By: _____
Richard H. Tushin
Registration No. 27,297
Franklin Square, Third Floor West
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3353
(202) 906-8680